

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants originally submitted Claims 1-26 in the application. In response to an election requirement, the Applicants provisionally selected Claims 1-7 without traverse and withdrew Claims 8-26. In previous responses, the Applicants amended Claims 1-3 and canceled dependent Claim 3 without prejudice or disclaimer. In the present preliminary amendment, the Applicants have amended independent Claim 1 and have not canceled or added any claims. Accordingly, Claims 1-2 and 4-7 are currently pending in the application.

The Applicant has carefully considered this application in connection with the telephonic interview with the Examiner on February 22, 2007, and respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of amended Claim 1. As discussed during the interview, the Applicant has amended independent Claim 1 to now read "terminating points for said components for continuous operation thereof." The present amendment does not add new matter. Support for the amendment can be found, for example, in paragraphs 22-23, 25 and 31-33 of the original specification. Accordingly, Claim 1 and each pending dependent Claim should now be in condition for allowance.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 2 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner previously rejected Claims 1, 2 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,087,834 to Tury, *et al.* The Applicant respectfully disagrees since Tury, as agreed upon during the interview, does not teach or suggest a centralized connector module as recited in independent Claim 1 that includes a dielectric body having interconnected terminal sets corresponding to components connectable thereacross and configured to provide terminating points for the components for continuous operation thereof. On the contrary, Tury

discloses a hand-held diagnostic tester 10 that is connected to a lighting system to perform testing of the lighting system. (See column 1, lines 52-53, column 3, lines 46-47, column 5, lines 47-56, and the Abstract.)

Thus, Tury fails to teach or suggest each element of independent Claim 1. As such, Tury does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness of amended independent Claim 1 and Claims dependent thereon. As such, Claims 1-2 and 7 are not unpatentable in view of Tury. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 1-2 and 7 and allow issuance thereof.

II. Rejection of Claims 4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Previously, the Examiner rejected Claims 4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tury in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,728,616 to Cheek, *et al.* The Applicants respectfully disagree.

As discussed above, Tury does not teach or suggest a centralized connector module as recited in independent Claim 1. Cheek has not been cited to cure the deficiencies of Tury but to teach the subject matter of dependent Claims 4 and 6. Additionally, Cheek does not cure the deficiencies of Tury since Cheek teaches an apparatus that is used to test for the continuity and erroneous connections of a plurality of wired connections. (See column 1, lines 30-32.) Thus, instead of disclosing a central connector module including continuity circuits, Cheek teaches a separate device that is used to check continuity of circuits. Cheek, therefore, does not cure the deficiencies of Tury.

As such, Tury and Cheek, individually or in combination, does not teach or suggest each and every element of independent Claim 1 and Claims dependent thereon. Thus, the cited combination of Tury and Cheek does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness of independent Claim 1 and Claims 4 and 6 which depend thereon. The cited combination, therefore, does not render obvious Claims 4 and 6. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw §103(a) rejection of Claims 4 and 6 and allow issuance thereof.

III. Rejection of Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has previously rejected Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tury in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,323,652 to Collier, *et al.* The Applicants respectfully disagree.

As discussed above, Tury does not teach or suggest a centralized connector module as recited in amended independent Claim 1. Collier discloses an electrical testing device for determining the continuity between ground terminals of an electrical power cord and determining the electrical grounding of an electrical power tool. (*See Abstract.*) Collier has not been cited to cure the deficiencies of Tury but to teach the subject matter of dependent Claim 5. As such, the cited combination of Tury and Collier does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness of independent Claim 1 and Claim 5 which depends thereon. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claim 5 and allow issuance thereof.


IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicant now sees all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicits a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-2 and 4-7.

The Applicant requests the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits or overpayments to Deposit Account 08-2395.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, PC



J. Joel Justiss
Registration No. 48,981

Dated: February 26, 2007

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800